

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
July 19, 2017
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Vice Chair Hoffman called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Argenta, Field (departed 7:55 p.m.), Gudritz, Hoffman, Murdock, Tartaglia
Absent: Allen (excused)
Also Present: Mayor Ken Roth, Planning Consultant Elmiger

2. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION Field, support by Gudritz, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: June 21, 2017

MOTION Murdock, support by Field, to approve the June 21, 2017 minutes as published. Motion carried unanimously.

5. REPORTS:

- A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:** None
- B. CITY COUNCIL:** None
- C. PLANNING COMMISSIONER:** None
- D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS:** None

6. PUBLIC HEARING: None.

7. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE:

CASE #1

ROSS WORLEY

PAINT

115 LINDEN STREET

Ross Worley, 155 Linden Street, was present on behalf of this application to paint his home. He distributed paint chips for SW 7056 Reserved White, SW 7508 Tavern Taupe, and SW 6300 Burgundy. The Tavern Taupe would be used for the siding and Reserved White for the trim. The Burgundy would be used as an optional trim color as shown on the photograph in the packets, though it was possible the Burgundy would not be used and the entire trim would be Reserved White. The garage would be painted to match. The windows would be white vinyl, and the window trim would also be white.

MOTION Gudritz, support by Field, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Murdock, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in

particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 5-18 paint and color.

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman called the vote.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #2

**ORIN JEWELERS
101 E. MAIN & 108 N. CENTER**

AWNINGS

Orin Mazzoni Jr. and Antoinette Mazzoni Kramer were present on behalf of this application, which was a request to put new fabric on existing awning frames on the Main Street and Center Street façades of the building. The awnings would contain business signs. They were changing to a new logo and were changing the color on the 108 Center Street awning to blue.

Ms. Kramer distributed a sample of the color Meadowgreen 1642 by Axalta for the cursive “O”, and a scaled and dimensioned drawing of the sign.

Commissioner Argenta pointed out that the July 10, 2017 Carlisle/Wortman review noted that the applicant would need to reduce the number of signs to one per frontage. Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the Building Official would evaluate the signs for conformance with the zoning ordinance.

MOTION Murdock, support by Field, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-23 awnings, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color.

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman called the vote.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #3

**PAUL SKLUT
512 W. DUNLAP**

ADDITION

Paul Sklut, 512 W. Dunlap, was present on behalf of this application, which was a request to change the new garage design that had been approved by the HDC on April 19, 2017. The roofline had been altered in order to accommodate a change in the staircase, and the changes were seen in the east and north elevations. The revised plans included a bathroom; the garage would not be used for habitable purposes. The north elevation now showed an additional small window on the left side of the gable and the east elevation included a small dormer.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Planning Consultant Elmiger said that a bathroom could be installed in a freestanding accessory building. However, no habitable space items could be included, such as a bedroom or kitchen.

MOTION Murdock, support by Field, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, based on the previously approved drawings and the revisions to those drawings presented today showing a new window on the east elevation, a new window on the north elevation and a new dormer on the north elevation.

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman called the vote.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #4

**BRIAN MAIORANA/160 MAIN
158 E. MAIN STREET**

**UPGRADE TO
BUILDING FAÇADE**

Brian Maiorana, 36157 Parklane Circle, Farmington Hills, MI and William Carpenter, Principal, A3 studios Architects P.C., 1441 E. Maple Rd., Suite 312, Troy, MI were present on behalf of this application.

Mr. Maiorana explained that the project was for an Italian restaurant, and this would be their second location. They offered a relaxed fine dining atmosphere, with décor based on some modern as well as rustic elements, thus bridging the gap between Old World and New. The restaurant offered a made to order from scratch kitchen, and they sourced seasonal products from local farms and from Eastern Market. They felt they were a value added to the City and they were excited about this downtown property. They were aware that they would have to come back to the HDC with further details. This evening they would address more crucial elements so that they could move forward in a timely way with Planning Commission and City Council meetings, as well as financing and purchase agreements.

Mr. Carpenter referenced their July 19, 2017 memo. As noted in that memo, and as shown on the drawings in the packets, the building enhancements included:

1. New storefront and entry vestibule on the north elevation facing Main Street.
2. Three new high and low windows on the west elevation facing the park.
3. One new decorative balcony with patio doors on the west elevation facing the park.
4. New medium stile vinyl clad wood and glass door on the west elevation.
5. New 2 color paint scheme for the north, west and south facing elevations.

Items for further review at the following HDC meeting included:

1. Awning colors
2. South elevation loading dock deck, service door, railing, utility screening, loading zone configuration.
3. Signage
4. New decorative wall mounted light fixtures on the west elevation facing the park
5. A shared, framed glass message board for community and restaurant information on the west elevation facing the park

Part of the 2nd floor would be removed to create a more dramatic entry.

Commissioner Murdock noted that page 5 showed some existing details on the 2nd floor windows. There appeared to be small awnings that mimicked the 1st floor; these added character. The new design cleaned things up but it also seemed to him there was a loss of character of the building.

Mr. Carpenter said the intention was to have limestone surrounds. Mr. Maiorana added that the details that currently existed included round columns next to the windows – the only ones in the area. They were creating a cleaner, more succinct façade.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Field, Mr. Carpenter said the top cornice was being retained, but would be painted.

In response to comments from Commissioner Field, Mr. Carpenter said the names of the windows were itemized on the materials page and he also had brought some material samples this evening. They could provide cut sheets if necessary.

Commissioner Field asked about the wires and vines on the west wall, where windows were being added. Mr. Carpenter explained that they would keep the columns of growth and that was reflected in the renderings.

Mr. Maiorana further explained said that there was a contract with the DDA regarding the building, specifically regarding the wires and growing vines. They would keep some of those elements and incorporate them with the side of the building. Still, they needed to open up a very dark, cramped space with windows, while incorporating the climbing vines into the design. They had talked with the DDA about this; final terms had to be formalized. They would return to the HDC with the final configuration of the vines.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Mr. Maiorana said that next year they would like to have some outdoor bistro tables on the west side, with a patio in front.

Planning Consultant Elmiger commented that the applicant would also have to appear before the Planning Commission and probably the City Council because the proposed restaurant was an intensification of use and additional parking would be required. Also, the HDC should review and comment on the balcony. Because this building was located property line to property line, the balcony would project over city property, and the applicant would have to get permission to do that.

Mr. Maiorana explained that the balcony was a desirable decorative feature. They were hoping to have French doors that would open up the 2nd floor mezzanine seating area, providing fresh air there.

Commissioner Argenta asked if there was any way the balcony could be pulled back so that it was flush with the façade. Mr. Maiorana responded that the staircase was also in that area; the French doors could not be flush and still swing in.

Commissioner Argenta asked if the doors had to open, as they didn't actually lead anywhere. Mr. Maiorana said the idea was to provide fresh air, and for the positive entertainment value of having this seating overlook the town square, especially in the summer time.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that Planning Consultant Elmiger had a number of items on her review. Were there any items that still needed to be clarified?

Planning Consultant Elmiger asked for HDC comment regarding her evaluation that a site plan was not necessary for HDC review. The building had the exact same footprint as it did currently, and the Planning Commission would review the site plan.

The consensus of the Commission was that a site plan was not necessary.

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that existing elevations had not yet been provided.

In response to a request from Planning Consultant Elmiger, Mr. Carpenter addressed items in the review letter regarding the rear façade:

- The rear window – currently boarded up – would stay closed and would be refinished with the rest of the façade.
- Details regarding the rear deck would be presented at a later meeting, including final configuration and railing.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Mr. Carpenter said the light fixture on the west side was listed in the materials section.

Commissioner Argenta asked that the final drawings show an accurate representation of the balcony projection.

Commissioner Hoffman thought that not having awnings over the upper windows on the front (north) elevation created a bland façade. Commissioner Argenta pointed out that the current features were not really awnings but were a metal imitation of the lower mansard feature. Commissioner Field suggested raising the sign. He also felt the north elevation was less inviting than the west elevation.

Mr. Carpenter said they would take those comments into consideration.

Planning Consultant Elmiger asked the applicant to address the glass area underneath the balcony. Mr. Maiorana explained that the glass area was to be used as a community message board for upcoming events, etc., thus integrating the building more completely with the town square. The messaging would not be electronic.

Vice Chair Hoffman indicated he was ready for a motion.

MOTION Field, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Field, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-18 doors, 4-21 materials, 4-23 awnings, 5-14 windows, and 5-18 paint and color. This motion also includes the information in the A3 studios Architects P.C. memo dated 7/19/17, specifically paragraph A, items 1-5, with the understanding that the applicant would return to the HDC at a later date for the items under paragraph B, items 1-5.

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment.

Mayor Roth asked about the number of allowed signs per façade. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that as this building was on a corner, each façade could have a sign.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman returned the item to the Commission and called the vote.

Motion carried unanimously

CASE #5

**GREG PRESLEY/MARINO
528 RANDOLPH**

NEW HOME

Greg Presley, Presley Architecture LLC, 108 N. Center, Suite 205, Northville Michigan, was present on behalf of this application. Owners David and Linda Marino were also present.

Mr. Presley distributed a narrative response to the Carlisle/Wortman review letter, with the following attachments:

- Site configuration as approved by the Planning Commission
- Detached garage plan
- Manufacturer cut sheet, design per building elevations

Mr. Presley explained that they were proposing a new house on this property, which was the gateway from the west coming into the Historic District. The inspiration for the home was the Cotswold Cottage at Greenfield Village. They wanted to create a house that would offer a quiet entry to the Historic District, and yet be different from the historic inventory there.

The home would have 2900 square feet of habitable space. When the conservatory plus the upper level space were added, the house would have about 3800 square feet of habitable space.

Mr. Marino gave some background to this proposal, explaining various steps they had completed in order to bring the proposal to the Commission.

Mr. Presley explained that the site configuration distributed this evening had been approved by the Planning Commission. They had added property to the rear, bringing the site to 2 acres, with over 200 feet of frontage. This configuration allowed the stone fence at the front of the property. The maximum fence height would be 4 feet.

They would return to the HDC for material and paint approvals, as well as lighting approval.

Commissioner Field complimented the house as proposed.

Commissioner Field left the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

Brief discussion was held regarding the site condo request as a way to divide the property, as approved by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Argenta made some comments regarding architectural style. The Northville Historic Design Standards did not prohibit new construction and did not dictate style. However, the Standards did require architectural compatibility in terms of setbacks, materials, etc. The Commission had the right to review each application on an individual basis.

The subject lot was larger and differently configured than any other lot on the street. Additionally, the proposed home was considerably wider – at 80 feet – than nearby houses; it also appeared to be higher.

Mr. Marino explained the restrictions of the building envelope due to a flood plain in the rear. They could not go deeper into the site; their only alternative was to go wide.

Commissioner Argenta pointed out that the Guidelines required that materials and textures should be the same type as those that had already been frequently used in structures existing within a 300 foot

radius, should be commonly used in the era and neighborhood, and that imitation stone and stone façades were specifically prohibited. Also, detached garages should be to the rear of the house; no garages in the front of the house were allowed. Additionally, the Guidelines called for 2 small garage doors rather than 1 large garage door. Parking pads were prohibited in the front setback. However, in this case, the front setback was only 8 feet.

Mr. Marino said the front yard was the only place for the garage because of the flood easement.

Commissioner Argenta referred to the zoning ordinance, which prohibited garages in the front yard, specifically from the face of the building to the property line.

Vice Chair Hoffman said as Commissioner Argenta noted the site was unique, unlike any other site in the Historic District. He asked Mr. Presley to respond to Commissioner Argenta's comments.

Mr. Presley pointed out that this home would be over 100 feet from the nearest adjacent building. The lot was large, and the house would be sitting in the middle of the lot. Because of the configuration of the lot, the building had to be linear along the street.

Regarding the stone, this was at the very edge of the Historic District. The stone would be softened with ivy, and the completed structure would be complementary to the Historic District and the City of Northville. There was no value to requiring materials similar to other homes on the street, as the homes were not close to this one.

Mr. Marino said the Cotswold style would be a Victorian era building; he hoped to put very little wood on the house. Mr. Presley commented that board and batten siding would be used in some areas above the 2nd story; he thought approximately 30% of the building would be board and batten.

Commissioner Argenta said the façade was still stone. While the preamble to the Historic District Guidelines did not include anything regarding a certain style, and in fact the Secretary of Interior rules said a new structure should not be imitative, his concern was that there was a specific statement under *Materials* that said no stone façades were allowed.

Mr. Presley said the interesting irony was that they could build a contemporary structure with brick and glass at this location; he felt the proposed design was more appropriate than that. They were not imitating Cotswold, but were taking license with the idea of it and creating a new structure that had that kind of appeal. Also, Building Inspector Strong had told them they could construct the garage in the front yard, as long as it was behind the front yard setback.

Commissioner Argenta said that the Guidelines were absolute regarding prohibiting garages in front of the house.

Mr. Presley pointed out that the Guidelines were not rules. While he agreed with the Guidelines in most instances, the main difference here was the location and configuration of the site.

Commissioner Argenta said conceptually he loved the house design.

Vice Chair Hoffman asked the thoughts of other Commission members.

Commissioner Gudritz said he like the Cotswold style and thought it was a gorgeous home. However, he had come to the meeting unsure that the proposed home would fit within the Historic District. The explanation of the lot location and configuration, along with the fact that the neighbors were further away than usual made the proposal more acceptable. He was still grappling with the front garage.

Otherwise he thought the HDC could reasonably make an exception to the guidelines, given the unique nature of this lot. The structure would provide an impressive entre into Northville.

Commissioner Tartaglia said he didn't have a problem with the proportionality of the width; it was a large enough parcel to justify the design. The stone was broken up on some of the elevations and he didn't have any issues there either.

Commissioner Murdock said he also came in thinking the building was too substantial. After hearing the presentation, he would like to find a way to allow the project to go forward.

Mr. Marino said the detached garage was important. He said they were going to rework the garage, so that the 3rd bay would not have a garage door. The west elevation would therefore include a 16-foot wide door.

Commissioner Argenta said he liked the design including the front garage. He was just concerned about the wording of the ordinance and the Guidelines, and the HDC would have to make a decision as to how to move forward, in terms of waiving any inconsistencies or treating this as a special condition.

Vice Chair Hoffman said that if the Commission did decide to move this forward the applicants would need to come back at a future meeting for approval of details regarding material and paint colors, window sash and frame colors, and exterior lighting.

Mr. Presley explained that they needed to know if the Commission supported the architecture as presented. In response to a question from Vice Chair Hoffman, Mr. Presley said they would like to get conceptual approval this evening. If granted the conceptual approval, when they returned they would have the stone worked out, and offer more amplification of the plan and details related to it.

Planning Consultant Elmiger pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance did allow a front garage as long as it was not in the front yard setback. In any event, the applicant did have the option of seeking relief from the Board of Zoning Appeals if there was a zoning issue.

Vice Chair Hoffman indicated he was ready for a motion.

Commissioner Argenta, support by Gudritz, that the HDC grant conceptual approval of the application as presented, based on the drawings presented tonight and the July 19, 2017 letter from Presley Architecture, with the understanding that the applicant will return to the Commission with final drawings regarding the garage and site plan, along with material and paint colors, window sash and frame color, and exterior lighting, for full HDC approval.
Motion carried unanimously.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Hoffman, Mr. Presley said they would be returning in September or October. Vice Chair Hoffman suggested that Mr. Presley return with bullet items addressing the concerns from this meeting, rather than repeating a full presentation.

**CASE #6
TAMMY OLEXA
511 W. CADY**

BUILDING ADDITION

Tammy Olexa, 511 W. Cady Street was present on behalf of this application. William Carpenter, Principal, A3 studios Architects P.C., 1441 E. Maple Rd., Suite 312, Troy, MI, architect for this project, was also present.

Mr. Carpenter said they were returning with the requested modifications to the vertical 2-story addition, along with further details, including:

- Front elevation of addition
- Front porch details
- Rear balcony details
- Rear deck details

Commissioner Argenta said the details presented, specifically regarding the front porch, rear balcony, and rear deck, were complete.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Carpenter said the window on the west elevation was existing and had inadvertently been left off the original plans. Outstanding issues listed in the July 10, 2017 Carlisle/Wortman review letter were addressed in a response letter from A3 studios, also dated July 10, 2017.

Mr. Carpenter said that they had been notified by a neighbor of potential water problems with the house, and they had provided documentation of this to the Commission. The original house was designed to have 4 dormers that created the 2nd floor: 1 each in the front and back, and 2 off the side. In the course of 2 additions, at some point the 2 back corners were inbuilt, and there was a build-over. The result was a roof that created ice dams and icicles on the back of the house. There was evidence of water damage to the back wall. They needed to raise the rear ridge of the roof 1 foot in order to get adequate sloping and drain the water away.

Planning Consultant Elmiger advised that the previous demolition application approval had specifically excluded the roof. Therefore the applicant needed to return at the August meeting with a demo application for this situation, as without an appropriate application the demolition of that portion of the roof could not be approved. She suggested that the HDC approve what they could this evening, in order to allow the project to move forward.

Vice Chair Hoffman expressed concern that the applicant would be returning to the HDC for the 4th time.

After further discussion regarding process, Mr. Carpenter said they would like to get an understanding from the Commission as to how to move forward.

Vice Chair Hoffman said the HDC could approve changes related to the original application, and could also give conceptual approval to the new roof design, conditioned on the applicant returning to the next meeting with the demolition application. Commissioner Argenta suggested that the drawings presented this evening showing the new roof design be dated and included in the file. These could then be referenced at the next meeting.

Vice Chair Hoffman indicated he was ready for a motion.

MOTION Gudritz, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, for the work as presented, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-8 doors, 3-10 porches, 3-14 setback and spacing, 3-16 mass, 3-17 height, 3-18 scale, 3-19 proportion, 3-20 hierarchy, 3-21 rhythm, 3-21 materials, 3-23 garages, 5-4 masonry, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-14 windows, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color, and with the inclusion in the file the letters

from A3 studios dated June 30 and July 10, 2017 as work to be accomplished in response to the consultant's review.

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman called the vote.

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Tartaglia that the HDC provide conceptual approval for the rebuilding of a portion of the existing roof based on the submittal packet dated July 19, 2017, with the applicant returning at a future date to seek a demolition permit and a certificate of appropriateness to rebuild that portion of the existing roof. **Motion carried unanimously.**

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that the following project had received administrative approval:

1. 149 E. Main Street – replace cedar shake on mansard roof on front and rear façades.

9. DISCUSSION

Planning Consultant Elmiger was asked to follow up on 2 homes with unfinished projects.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Hoffman thanked the Commission for their service this evening.

Seeing that there was no further comment, Vice Chair Hoffman adjourned the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 09/16/2017